DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 180 TM 006 521

AUTHOR Smock, Richard; Hake, Harold
TITLE COPE: A Systematic Approach to the Evaluation of Academic Departments.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (61st, New York, New York, April 4-8, 1977); Appendices B and C may not reproduce well due to marginal legibility of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Chief Administrators; College Administration; *College Faculty; College Majors; College Programs; College Students; Confidentiality; *Departments; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Self Evaluation; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Surveys; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of academic departments at The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Campus is described. Guidelines have been established by the Council on Program Evaluation (COPE), which is composed of faculty, graduate, and undergraduate students. The self evaluation is conducted within the department, and the results are analyzed by COPE, which makes recommendations to the appropriate administrator. Surveys are completed by students, faculty, and departmental administrators. All student majors in the departmental program complete the Program Evaluation Survey, which provides information about departmental procedures and quality of the program. Faculty are asked to evaluate the performance of department heads, and to describe their perceptions of morale factors, departmental procedures, and the effect of outside administrators' actions on the department. (Author/MV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146180

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
RICHARD SMOCK
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

COPE: A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS*

Richard Smock
Chairman, Council on Program Evaluation
University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign

Harold Hake
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign

The Academic Department

While academic departments have been part of the University structure for many years, the meaning of the term, the method of organizing and governing the unit; indeed even the purpose of establishing and maintaining departments has evolved steadily over the years and there is no reason to believe that the process will not continue.

While there was reference to "departments" at Harvard as early as 1739 (Quincy, 1840), it was not until 1825 that Harvard was officially reorganized into six subdivisions that bore any resemblance to what we would recognize as departments today. Even so, the resemblance was slight. Dominated by a leading scholar-professor, who most commonly filled an endowed chair and surrounded himself with a number of lesser scholars and students whose activities he wholly determined, that early organizational structure was but a rudimentary means to support the careers of the chosen few (Storr, 1953). The early 1880's saw autonomous departments established at Johns Hopkins and Cornell, and rapidly spreading to other

*Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, April 4-8, 1977.

TM006 521

universities. By the early 1890's growth in the disciplines and in enrollments had led to the system of academic ranks with which we are familiar today; first at Harvard, then Columbia, later Yale and Princeton; but still departments were the private fief for life of a star professor appointed to the post (Veysey, 1965). The University of Chicago made an early move to break the autocratic monopoly of the major professor. In 1911 it began to allow departmental faculty to elect a chairman rather than have higher level administrators appoint one as in the past (Storr, 1953). The movement to elected rather than appointed chairman, roughly paralleling the "human relations" movement (Roethlisberger, 1948) in business and in industry continued until the 1950's.

It is interesting to find that the method of choosing a departmental leader has now come full circle. First, the appointment of the primary scholar in the discipline who then ruled the discipline with an iron hand. Then came the elected chairman, partly as a way to break the grip of the dominant professor. Now, particularly at large complex universities, the appointed head is the preferred method of choosing a departmental leader. Certainly the reasons for returning to the appointment process rather than relying on the election process have changed. The bureaucratization of universities and the sheer amount of management activities brought on by increasing complexity and the demands of outside publics make it more likely that the departmental leader will be a representative of the administration rather than the elected spokesman of the faculty in the future. Of course, the best department heads are those who behave as if they were chairmen, and academic traditions are influential in assuring that few heads maintain their positions if they are not acceptable to the faculty.

Increasing institutional complexity and the rapid growth of student populations following the second World War along with greatly expanded graduate programs and the massive influx of research money led to a corresponding increase in the number, size, and power of academic departments. No one would deny that departmental interests are today a major force in every American university (Dressel, 1970). In short, the department is the key piece in the modern university structure, and the department head a key figure on every college and university campus.

The point to be made is that departments themselves are a device created to handle the problems of increasing amounts of knowledge and the increasing size of disciplines and universities, causing the role of the department and the department leader to change and continue to change even now. One important aspect that has held constant over the years is that the quality of instructional and research programs, so vital to the life of the students and the reputation of the university, is tied most closely to the department as a disciplinary and administrative agency.

Program Evaluation

Dressel (1970) said it was easier to conduct a self-study in a small institution than in a large one, if only because a small college could be studied as a single organism. Large public supported institutions do not have that luxury and must conduct evaluations in smaller units. Because a department generally has its own operating budget and a degree of autonomy in developing curriculum and choosing staff, it is the logical unit on which to focus an evaluation.

The University of Illinois's (Urbana-Champaign) system of program evaluation has two characteristics that distinguish it from many evaluative

systems elsewhere; (1) It is built on an extensive foundation of thought and planning going back a number of years, and (2) It is faculty-based and largely a self-evaluative effort.

The early planning underlying the development of our program includes, first, the work of the Long-Range Planning Committees (1970-72) that produced "An Academic Plan for the Urbana-Champaign Campus." In addition to detailed recommendations involving most academic and administrative programs on the campus at all levels, the 1972 report recommended that we develop the staff and procedures necessary for a cyclical evaluation of all academic programs. The report stated:

> "In any activity undertaken on this campus, the pursuit of excellence should be the overriding objective; if resources do not permit both quantitative and qualitative growth, higher priority should be given to program quality.
>
> "Processes or mechanisms should be developed for identifying the quality and potential of each type of educational activity, for reorganizing the academic units, and for realigning the faculty and students in accord with the goals and priorities stated above."

The need for mechanisms to achieve the cyclical evaluation of programs that could identify and foster excellence on the campus was met by the Study Committee on Program Evaluation (SCOPE) that completed its report in 1972. That report and the actions taken on our campus in response to its recommendations produced our faculty-based system of self-evaluation that began functioning in 1973-74.

Following the recommendations of the SCOPE Report, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs appointed, with the concurrence of the Urbana-Champaign Academic Senate, a Council on Program Evaluation (COPE) headed by an Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Evaluation. The Council,

then and now, consisted of nine faculty members including five without administrative appointment, two undergraduate students, and two graduate students. The Council was charged with the responsibility of conducting in-depth evaluations of academic and administrative programs on the Urbana-Champaign campus, although this paper focuses exclusively on the evaluation of academic departments.

The underlying perspective brought to bear during the development of the evaluative activities of COPE was a desire to avoid uniform campus-wide perscriptive measures of quality and to rely primarily on the criteria and standards of excellence inherent in each discipline as the basis of judgment. In that respect it was to be more responsive than preordinate as defined in the literature of evaluation. Stake (1970) described the components of a responsive evaluation well:

> "An educational evaluation is responsive (1) if it orients more directly to program activities than to program intents, (2) if it responds to audience requirements for information, and (3) if the different value perspectives of the people at hand are referred to in reporting the success and failure of the program. In these three separate ways an evaluation plan can be responsive."

The Process

As COPE has gained experience the process for gathering and treating evaluative information has changed. During the first two years COPE relied on "task groups" organized with members from within and outside the department being evaluated. These task groups followed an extensive but general evaluation outline to gather their information. Task groups conducted interviews with faculty, administrators, and students and examined data supplied by the department itself as well as other campus agencies. Approximately 28 departments have been evaluated by this method.

During the last two years the emphasis has shifted from an evaluation conducted by a task group to a self-evaluation following COPE guidelines completed by the department. In either a task group or self-evaluation the resulting report is forwarded to the Council which discusses it in detail and makes its recommendations to the appropriate administrator. The Council itself has only the authority to recommend; it has no authority to act, thus any actions resulting from the recommendations of the Council are initiated by the administrator to whom they are addressed. Most recommendations fall in the province of the department itself; some require action by a dean, and a few are addressed to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This insures that outcomes of the recommendations are subject to the normal administrative processes and tempered by the organizational and political realities of the campus.

Information

Information for the self-evaluation report is provided by students, faculty, and departmental administrators. All student majors in the department provide their perceptions of departmental operations affecting them on a specially prepared questionnaire, the Program Evaluation Survey (PES). (See Appendix A for a brief description of the development and use of the PES.) Faculty are asked to evaluate the performance of the department head on a form developed at Kansas State University, and modified slightly for use on our campus (Hoyt, 1976). Attached to the form is an additional sheet requesting faculty perceptions of morale factors, the operation of certain departmental procedures, and the effect of administrators outside of the department on departmental operations. (Appendix B has a copy of the department form and a copy of the appended set of questions.)

Of central importance to the self-evaluation is a narrative report prepared by faculty and administrators in the department following guidelines provided by COPE. The units are invited to explore an extensive set of questions inquiring into their view of the discipline nationally, the specifics of departmental organization including its operating procedures and structures, its methods for handling curriculum problems, the record of faculty research and scholarship, service and continuing education activities, and an appraisal of present problems facing the department regardless of their nature. Data concerning tenure, promotion, courses taught, and budget are supplied for the report by central sources on campus when available as well as the department itself. The resulting report is a mixture of collegial impressions and judgments, student majors' perceptions of programmatic aspects of departmental operation, demographic and financial data, and extensive detailed description. This report is considered to be the raw data for use by the Council and is confidential. Later, a public Action Report containing a summary of the self-evaluation, the recommendations made by the Council, and the reaction of the department to those recommendations released.

The Purpose of Academic Program Evaluation

Following the original statement of the Long-Range Planning Committee, the primary purpose of the COPE evaluation is to enhance quality in academic units. COPE aspires to promoting high standards of teaching, research, and service in all departments but recognizes that each discipline has a unique definition of quality and its own standards of excellence. Following the COPE self-evaluation guidelines, we ask departments to lay out those definitions and measure themselves against them.

COPE provides departments with an alternative to the normal channel of communications operating through deans and vice chancellors. A faculty committee directly accessible to the department and in communication with all levels of the administration can be a positive contribution to the functioning of departments. Because the Council draws its membership from mature faculty members whose academic records are exemplary and whose credibility is widely accepted, its recommendations often reflect its own well-recognized and difficult-to-assail values. The makeup of the Council is well-suited to representing the highest expectations of a University oriented toward research and graduate study and helps assure that those high standards will be maintained. Except as each COPE member is part of a larger community the Council does not represent the demands placed on the institution by outside audiences, including state legislators, alumni, and state boards of higher education. It is the role of the Chancellor and other campus-level administrators to discern and interpret those demands in a manner most compatible to building the future of the University. The fact that COPE makes its recommendations through regular administrative channels insures that its standards will be interpreted in the light of those more complete institutional realities.

Program Evaluation and the Budget Process

During its early years especially there was much concern that COPE would serve as a budget-cutting arm of the administration looking for ways to siphon dollars away from departments. Evidence that that has happened would be difficult to find. The chairman of the Council ordinarily attends the Vice Chancellor's budget meetings during budget preparation. However, the Vice Chancellor allocates money to colleges while deans have the responsibility of apportioning departmental budgets. Discussions with

deans over a period of time about the activities of COPE has indicated that the evaluation process discovers little that was previously unknown to them. It does serve the purpose of systematically gathering evidence and injecting written recommendations into the administrative system in a way that makes action more likely. However, the fears of those early critics have not come to pass. Evaluating to enhance quality seldom uncovers significant sums of money that can better be used elsewhere. On the other hand, COPE has recommended allocation of special funds to alleviate needs documented through the self-evaluation. COPE has recommended that the Office of Space Utilization make special reviews of departmental needs in cases where the evaluation indicates that the formulas ordinarily used for assigning space are not adequate to meet particular problems.

COPE has recommended a major revision of an entire program only once. Even in that instance the recommendation was to keep the money within the affected college to improve the restructured programs; it did not recommend the transfer of any funds to other units on campus. That restructuring recommendation went to the administrators involved who handled it in light of the parameters effecting their decision-making powers, which included the political realities both on and off campus, the problems of staffing created by tenured faculty, and the needs of present students who had to be assurred of being able to complete their degree work.

Program Evaluation and the Planning Process

Because COPE's purpose is to enhance quality it is not directed specifically to the planning process. Program evaluation at some other universities is intended to provide administrators with information of more direct use to budgeting and planning but may in the process become less sensitive to those problems and issues within a discipline effecting

the optimum use of resources. COPE evaluations do encourage short- and long-range planning within the unit but the Council is most concerned that such planning is taking place in a reasonable and competent manner. The results of departmental planning are submitted for action through other administrative channels at the appropriate time. As an aid to departmental planning, the Council looks for evidence that the department has a clear focus on the status of the discipline nationally, on the relation of the discipline to other research and instructional programs on campus, on enrollment trends in the discipline, and on the direction and emphasis of the discipline most appropriate for the future.

Program Evaluation and the Problems of Confidentiality

To be useful, COPE evaluations of necessity contain much information that must be privileged. On the other hand it faces a legitimate demand for information about programs from people both on and off the campus. COPE asks faculty to give their best judgments about the performance of departmental administrators. The Council asks that departments discuss their problems in detail and depth. The Council asks students to provide information about their perceptions of the quality of programs offered to them. Those people providing information have a right to expect that the information will be handled in a manner that in no way compromises them. On the other hand, administrators expected to act on problems have a right to know the factual and judgmental basis of those problems. Thus, there is an unavoidable tension inherent in any program evaluation system. The Council has chosen to operate as openly as possible consistent with a high regard for privileged information. The self-evaluation reports from the departments and the recommendations emanating from those reports are shared with the administrators who are expected to act. In many cases,

departmental representatives are invited to meet with COPE when it is formulating its recommendations. During discussions relating to personnel matters Council meetings are closed to the public and press and information is shared with those beyond the Council only when there is an overriding need to know.

Any major evaluation effort has a responsibility to report to the campus community and others. The Action Report, a careful summary of the evaluation report plus a more complete report of the recommendations based on the self-evaluation report and the results of those recommendations, has proven to be a satisfactory means to meet that commitment.

Outcomes

The outcomes of evaluation are always of interest to researchers. Many have talked about evaluation for decision making. There are discrepancy evaluations, objective-based evaluations, goal-free evaluations, and any number of others. When gauging the results of evaluation, too often there is an assumption that finding "x" should equate with decision "y" in some easily traceable and manifestly obvious manner. Such is not the case with the more responsive kind of program evaluation being practiced at the University of Illinois. Certainly change does occur; many changes both large and small. But the connection of those changes to program evaluation are often subtle and difficult to trace. Many changes occur simply because program evaluation exists. Departments form committees to improve promotion procedures, to develop by-laws, and to review curriculum when they are scheduled for a self-evaluation. Did the evaluation cause the change? Resignations occur, and new voices are listened to within the department at a point in time far distant from an actual evaluation. Was there any link between those events and the

evaluation? Search committees apply more rigorous standards to candidates and promotion committees act to maintain the quality of their department. Is there any connection here? The fact that linkages are hard to delineate is perhaps an indication of a positive evaluation effort rather than a poor one. The evaluation is not meant to be prescriptive, but rather to provide the impetus for change within departments on campus. Perhaps the process—the flow of information and recommendations—is as important as the report that is considered.

There have been instances where money has been allocated to establish a new activity or to purchase new instructional equipment specifically recommended by COPE. The need for travel funds was eased partly by recommendations from COPE. As with the great majority of evaluations, the process did not discover new needs. It only documented them and placed recommendations in the appropriate administrative channels.

Any program evaluation that is thorough and penetrating is likely to be controversial. Certainly perfection is to be found in few places and recommendations that draw attention to lack of perfection are sure to be threatening to many, even though others are sure to be pleased. The type of program evaluation represented by COPE can exist only on a campus where its activities are credible to both faculty and to administrators. If the evaluation should lose the confidence of the faculty, departments will subvert the operation. If it should lose the confidence of the administrators, they can choose to ignore the recommendations.

Most faculty accept the need for responsible and thorough program review. Although we have no evidence that bears on the issue of whether or not internal evaluation blunt the demand for external evaluations, some believe that if campuses do not continuously monitor their programs to

enhance quality other, less acceptable, agencies will impose their own evaluation designs on the campus. Other faculty find in the COPE process a chance to have their points-of-view considered by a faculty group outside of, but with access to, the normal administrative channels, and administrators often find the documentation of problems provided by the program evaluation useful in resolving long-standing problems within departments.

REFERENCE LIST

Dressel, P.L., Johnson, F.C., & Marcus, P.M. The Confidence Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Hoyt, D.P. Interpreting Faculty Ratings of the Academic Chairperson/Head (second revision). Manhattan, Kansas: Office of Educational Resources, Kansas State University, 1976.

Quincy, J. The History of Harvard University. Cambridge: Crosby, Nichols, Lee & Co., 1840.

Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. Management and the Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Stake, R.E. Program Evaluation, Particularly Responsive Evaluation (Occasional Paper No. 5). Kalamazoo, Michigan: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, 1975.

Storr, R.J. The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America. University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Veysey, L.R. The Emergence of the American University. University of Chicago Press, 1965.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND THE

PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY AT UIUC

The Background of Program Evaluation

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) has initiated a major effort to evaluate all academic departments on a cyclical schedule. Our present activities had their start in the work of two major campus committees. One, the 1970-72 Long-Range Planning Committee, recommended that the University develop the staff and procedures necessary for a cyclical evaluation of all academic programs. Recognizing the beginning of the financially difficult period presently facing most universities, the report stated:

> In any activity undertaken on this campus, the pursuit of excellence should be the overriding objective; if resources do not permit both quantitative and qualitative growth, higher priority should be given to program quality.
>
> Processes or mechanisms should be developed for identifying the quality and potential for each type of educational activity, for reorganizing the academic units, and for realigning the faculty and students in accord with the goals and priorities stated above.

The second committee, the Study Committee on Program Evaluation (SCOPE), responded to this call for evaluation activity with a 1972 report providing the initial groundwork for our faculty-based system of academic self-evaluation. The report provided a rationale and a set of initial operating procedures for academic program evaluation. This report is widely respected throughout the country and forms the basis for several systems in operation at the present time. The report and the actions taken in response to its recommendations led to the establishment of the Council on Program Evaluation (COPE) which is now in its third year of activity.

The Council on Program Evaluation

Following the recommendations of the SCOPE Report, an Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Evaluation was appointed in 1973 with the approval of the Urbana-Champaign Academic Senate. The Council, consisting of nine faculty (the majority without administrative appointments), two undergraduate and two graduate students, was chaired by the Associate Vice Chancellor and charged with the responsibility of establishing in-depth evaluation programs on campus. The Council considers the results of departmental evaluations made either by the department or by an especially appointed task group and makes its resulting recommendations to the appropriate administrator, whether that be the department chairman, a dean, or the Chancellor.

An early and ongoing task was to develop a system of collecting and reporting evaluative data which would provide the Council with useful

information for its deliberations. Always sensitive to the difficulties of applying pre-specified criteria to a number of disciplines with different traditions and different styles, COPE has emphasized information collection guidelines that recognize the unique nature of different academic departments.

The Office of Instructional Resources has had the primary responsibility for developing, implementing and interpreting objective measures that seem suitable to the task and are in keeping with COPE's principles.

As we gain experience we are directing our efforts toward developing and validating questionnaires that are as specific as possible. In addition to the continuing development and validation of questionnaires, we are actively involved in: (1) establishment of data collection procedures which are both reliable and as unobtrusive as possible; (2) development of methods for empirical analysis and interpretation of data; (3) creation of data banks and norms for research and reporting purposes; (4) computerized generation of reports which are easily read and understood by users; and (5) systematic reporting of evaluation data to those who will make use of it in the judgmental process.

The Program Evaluation Survey

One instrument currently under development is the Program Evaluation Survey (PES), a questionnaire designed to assess the level of undergraduate and graduate student satisfaction with various aspects of university academic programs of study. The original PES was developed and pilot tested in 1973 at the request of COPE by a faculty and student committee. It was revised in 1974 and will continue to be revised as we gain campus experience. The current version is supplied as Attachment A. Since its first use, the questionnaire has been administered to approximately 8,000 graduate and undergraduate majors in 30 academic departments. During the 1976-77 academic year an additional 26 departments were surveyed.

Departments at UIUC are typically surveyed at the request of COPE, but academic deans, department chairpersons, or departmental level committees may also request that surveys be conducted within their respective departments. Procedures for collecting PES information are best arranged to accommodate the operating schedules of the specific department.

Just as data collection procedures may be modified to suit individual departments, data reporting procedures and format vary according to user needs. For example, data reported at the departmental level are generally more detailed and diagnostic than data reported to college or university level committees. Thus the PES must provide for the convenient computer generation of tailor-made reports which are conceptually accurate but are also easily understood and interpreted by users not thoroughly familiar with statistical terminology.

Samples of three standardized PES reports most frequently requested are described in the following paragraphs. Copies may be obtained on request.

COPE Report

All departments surveyed in any single academic year at the request of COPE are identified in the University-wide COPE Report. Each page of a COPE Report provides a graphic profile of student responses to a single PES item. For every PES item, survey results for all departments are depicted with separate profiles for graduates and undergraduates so that appropriate comparisons can be made. Included with each COPE Report are written guidelines for reading and interpreting the survey data.

Departmental Profile

The departmental profile is designed to provide a graphic view of intra-departmental strengths and weaknesses as perceived by student majors across all 24 items in the PES Form. Again, survey results are reported separately for graduate and undergraduate students so differences in response patterns are easily evident. Written interpretation guidelines are furnished and often faculty or other departmental representatives request a meeting with a staff member to analyze the information.

QUICTAB

The QUICTAB program is used to provide analysis of response patterns for specific student groups identified in the demographic or optional item section of the PES questionnaire. This format is frequently used in reporting special analyses requested by departments. Such analyses are often used to investigate intra-departmental differences among curricular divisions which comprise the departmental structure.

Although the organization and implementation of COPE has provided the impetus for the development and use of PES at UIUC, use of the PES does not necessitate the creation of a formal evaluation council. University committee structures which foster ongoing self-assessment can provide a convenient mechanism for using PES information. PES experience on this campus has indicated that it is indeed possible to assess the level of student satisfaction with academic programs and that such systematic assessment can facilitate the campus and college level governance process. Moreover, information provided to departments has encouraged serious discussion on curricular and program issues.

Research toward the improvement, validation and assessment of usefulness will continue throughout the coming year. Departments, colleges, and universities wishing further information on the topics described here may write or call the following individuals:

For information on COPE:

Professor Harold Hake
Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning
and Evaluation
University of Illinois
107 Coble Hall
Champaign, IL 68120
(217) 333-2353

For information on program evaluation and PES development and use:

Richard Smock, Chairperson
COPE Council
107 Coble Hall
Champaign, IL 68120
(217) 333-2353

For information on PES systems development and use:

Dale Brandenburg
Coordinator of Instructor and Course Evaluation
Measurement and Research Division
Office of Instructional Resources
University of Illinois
307 Engineering Hall
Urbana, IL 68101
(217) 333-3490

PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY

SIDE ONE

Measurement and Research Division, Office of Instructional Resources © The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois 1975

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: This "PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY" was designed to elicit your opinions about the program of studies you are currently pursuing (i.e., your major). When you are answering the items please consider your reactions toward your major and your department as a whole and not specifically toward any one course or instructor. This survey is one facet of an overall departmental evaluation.

USE PENCIL PLEASE

SECTION I

DEPT. CODE (0-9 in each column)

STATUS: FRESH; SOPH; JUNIOR; SENIOR; MASTERS; DOCTORAL; OTHER

SEX: MALE; FEMALE

HOW MANY COMPLETE SEMESTERS HAVE YOU BEEN A STUDENT ON THIS CAMPUS IN YOUR CURRENT MAJOR? 0-1; 2-3; 4-5; 6 PLUS

RECORD YOUR CUMULATIVE GPA: 4.6 OR ABOVE; 3.61 - 4.59; 3.6 OR BELOW

UNDERGRADS ONLY

A. TRANSFER STATUS: NOT A TRANSFER STUDENT; TRANSFER FROM A FOUR YEAR INSTITUTION; TRANSFER FROM A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

B. MY PRIMARY REASON FOR CHOOSING THIS MAJOR WAS: PREPARATION FOR GRAD. OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL; FOR IMMEDIATE ENTRY INTO A VOCATION; NEITHER, I PLAN TO CHANGE MAJORS; OTHER

GRADS ONLY

FROM WHERE DID YOU OBTAIN YOUR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE? MY PRESENT DEPT.; ANOTHER DEPT. ON THIS CAMPUS; SAME OR SIMILAR DEPT. ON ANOTHER CAMPUS; A DIFFERENT DEPT. ON ANOTHER CAMPUS

SECTION II

DIRECTIONS: For each of the items below indicate your opinion of your major or your department by marking the point on the scale which most nearly expresses your opinion--the middle point on the scale indicates an opinion of "about right".

		ABOUT RIGHT						
1. The level of difficulty of your major program.	TOO EASY						TOO DIFFICULT	
2. The amount of structure in your academic program (curriculum).	TOO FLEXIBLE						TOO RIGID	
3. The availability of enrichment activities offered in addition to regular classes. (Seminars, Colloquia, Social Events, etc.).	TOO MANY						TOO FEW	
4. The variety of course offerings.	TOO MANY						TOO FEW	
5. The departmental admissions standards.	TOO HIGH						TOO LOW	
6. The orientation of the majority of your course work.	TOO PRACTICAL						TOO THEORETICAL	

The degree of emphasis which your department places on each of the following. (DK indicates Don't Know).

7. Preparing undergraduates who want to go into graduate school or professional school.	TOO GREAT					TOO LITTLE	DK
8. Graduate education.	TOO GREAT					TOO LITTLE	DK
9. Providing students with credentials for obtaining employment after graduation.	TOO GREAT					TOO LITTLE	DK
10. Some students are more absorbed in, and enthusiastic about their majors than others. Describe your attitude toward your major program.	INDIFFERENCE					DEDICATION	

SECTION III

DIRECTIONS: For the following items, rate your level of satisfaction with your major or department by marking one point which most nearly expresses your attitude:

	SATISFACTION						
11. The extent to which you are challenged by your program of study.	HIGH						LOW
12. The extent to which your major program provides a well integrated set of courses.	HIGH						LOW
13. The overall quality of instruction in your major department.	HIGH						LOW
14. On the average, the quality of texts and other instructional materials used by instructors in your department.	HIGH						LOW
15. Classroom evaluation procedures (Graded tests, papers, etc.).	HIGH						LOW
16. The accessability of instructors for conferences outside of class.	HIGH						LOW
17. The quality of academic guidance.	HIGH						LOW
18. The quality of vocational guidance.	HIGH						LOW
19. The channels of communications between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.	HIGH						LOW
20. The departmental support staff (Secretarial, Clerical, etc.) who deal directly with students.	HIGH						LOW
21. Size of lower level (100-200) classes.	HIGH						LOW
22. Size of upper level (300-400) classes.	HIGH						LOW
23. The extent to which you regard your program of study as worthwhile.	HIGH						LOW
24. Overall satisfaction with your major program.	HIGH						LOW

PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY

SECTION IV

DIRECTIONS: If your department could receive a greater percentage of the University's resources for any of the following reasons, which three of these should receive top priority? Please number your three choices in order of importance.

25	1 2 3	Provide more instructional equipment and material.	30	1 2 3	Provide more financial support for graduate students.
26	1 2 3	Support instructional development activities to foster better teaching.	31	1 2 3	Provide more support for faculty research.
27	1 2 3	Provide incentives for good teaching.	32	1 2 3	Provide more support for student research.
28	1 2 3	Expand graduate curriculum.	33	1 2 3	Other (specify)_____
29	1 2 3	Expand undergraduate curriculum.			_____

SECTION V OPTIONAL ITEM SECTION

| | | | | |

FACULTY RATINGS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON/HEAD*

Council on Program Evaluation
University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this form to describe your perception of your department chairperson/head. To encourage objectivity and candor, responses should be made anonymously.

The list below describes 15 activities which some department chairpersons/heads pursue. In the space by items 1-15, fill in the response which best describes your judgment of how IMPORTANT each of these should be for your chairperson/head, using the code below.

Fill in spaces by items 16-30 to describe how effectively you feel your department chairperson/head performed each function during the past 12 months. Leave the item blank if you feel you cannot make a valid judgment; otherwise use the following code to rate PERFORMANCE.

CODE FOR IMPORTANCE
1 = Not Important
2 = Only So-So
3 = Fairly Important
4 = Quite Important
5 = Essential

CODE FOR PERFORMANCE
1 = Poor
2 = Only So-So
3 = In Between
4 = Good
5 = Outstanding

DEPARTMENT _____

	IMPORTANCE		PERFORMANCE	
1	____	16	____	Guides the development of sound procedures for assessing faculty performance.
2	____	17	____	Recognizes and rewards faculty in accordance with their contributions to department's program.
3	____	18	____	Guides development of sound organizational plans to accomplish departmental program.
4	____	19	____	Arranges effective and equitable allocation of faculty responsibilities such as committee assignments, teaching loads, etc.
5	____	20	____	Takes lead in recruitment of promising faculty.
6	____	21	____	Fosters good teaching in the department.
7	____	22	____	Stimulates research and scholarly activity in the department.
8	____	23	____	Guides curriculum development.
9	____	24	____	Maintains faculty morale by reducing, resolving, or preventing conflicts.
10	____	25	____	Fosters development of each faculty member's special talents or interests.
11	____	26	____	Understands and communicates expectations of the campus administration
12	____	27	____	Effectively communicates the department's needs (personnel, space, monetary) to the dean.
13	____	28	____	Facilitates obtaining grants and contracts from extramural sources.
14	____	29	____	Improves the department's image and reputation in the total campus community.
15	____	30	____	Encourages an appropriate balance among academic specializations within the department.

*Adapted by the Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign with permission of the Office of Educational Resources, Kansas State University.

Use spaces by items 31-63 to indicate how frequently each of the following statements is description of your department chairperson/head.

Code
1 = Rarely ever (not at all descriptive)
2 = Less than half the time.
3 = About half the time
4 = More than half the time
5 = Almost always (very descriptive)

The department chairperson/head:

31. _____ Makes own attitudes clear to the faculty.
32. _____ Tries out new ideas with the faculty.
33. _____ Assigns faculty members to particular tasks.
34. _____ Works without a plan.
35. _____ Maintains definite standards of performance.
36. _____ Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.

37. _____ Encourages the use of uniform procedures.
38. _____ Makes sure his/her part in the department is understood by all members.
39. _____ Lets faculty members know what's expected of them.
40. _____ Sees to it that faculty members are working up to capacity.
41. _____ Sees to it that the work of faculty members is coordinated.

42. _____ Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the faculty.
43. _____ Is easy to understand.
44. _____ Keeps to him/herself.
45. _____ Looks out for the personal welfare of individual faculty members.
46. _____ Refuses to explain actions.

47. _____ Acts without consulting the faculty.
48. _____ Is slow to accept new ideas.
49. _____ Treats all faculty members as his/her equal.
50. _____ Is willing to make changes.
51. _____ Makes faculty members feel at ease when talking to them.
52. _____ Puts faculty suggestions into action.

53. _____ Gets faculty approval on important matters before proceeding.
54. _____ Postpones decisions unnecessarily.
55. _____ Is more a reactor than an initiator.
56. _____ Makes it clear that faculty suggestions for improving the department are welcome.
57. _____ Is responsive to one "clique" in the faculty but largely ignores those who are not a member of the clique.
58. _____ In expectations of faculty members, makes allowance for their personal or situational problems.

59. _____ Lets faculty members know when they've done a good job.
60. _____ Explains the basis for his/her decisions.
61. _____ Gains input from faculty members on important matters.
62. _____ Acts as though visible departmental accomplishments were vital to him/her.
63. _____ Acts as though high faculty morale was vital to him/her.

Please continue to next page.

Department_____

_____

Use this space to clarify your previous ratings or make other comments which would help your department chairperson/head improve administrative effectiveness.

In many departments there is a division of departmental administrative responsibility. While this questionnaire has asked you to evaluate specifically the department head, we also ask you to evaluate the overall administration of the department, and other departmental administrative officers. These may be the associate head, the assistant head, the administrative assistant, or other positions having administrative responsibili Complete as many as are appropriate for your department.

Rate the performance of:

1. **The overall department administration:** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
   Excellent ... Poor

2. **Other administrative officer:** _____
   Title
   _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
   Excellent ... Poor

3. **Other administrative officer:** _____
   Title
   _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
   Excellent ... Poor

4. **Other Administrative officer:** _____
   Title
   _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
   Excellent ... Poor

Comments: (Refer to numbers [1-4] above)

The department's program also may be influenced or affected by administrative offices other than the departmental office. Use the space below to express your perception of the effect of any of the following administrative offices upon your departm nt's progr m.

Office of the School Director:

☐ Not Applicable 5. **Promotes and protects department autonomy** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Very much so ... Very little

☐ Not Applicable 6. **Facilitates good departmental operations** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Very much so ... Very little

Office of the Dean of the College:

☐ Not Applicable 7. **Promotes and protects department autonomy** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Very much so ... Very little

☐ Not Applicable 8. **Facilitates good departmental operations** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Very much so ... Very little

Office of the Dean of the Graduate College and Vice Chancellor for Research:

☐ Not Applicable 9. **Promotes and protects department autonomy** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Very much so ... Very little

☐ Not Applicable 10. **Facilitates good departmental operations** _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Very much so ... Very little

Please complete other side

(Continuation)

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:

☐ Not Applicable 11. Promotes and protects department autonomy ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very much so / Very little

☐ Not Applicable 12. Facilitates good departmental operations ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very much so / Very little

Comments:

Below you are asked to give your appraisal of several issues not directly related to chairperson/head evaluation, but of important concern to a large number of faculty.

13. What is your estimate of faculty morale on campus? ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ High / Low

14. How would you rate morale in your department compared to that on campus? ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Higher / Lower

15. How is your morale? ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ High / Low

Comments:

Rate your degree of satisfaction with your department's promotion procedures and procedures for determining annual salary adjustments.

16. Promotion Procedures? ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very satisfied / Not satisfied

17. Procedures for salary determination? ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very satisfied / Not satisfied

18. Comments on the above procedures or other procedures of concern to you.